

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-16 and 19-24 are pending in the application. Favorable reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

Allowable Subject Matter

The Applicant notes with appreciation the conditional allowance of claim 5. Applicant, however, believes that all pending claims are allowable in view of the arguments below.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-4, 6-16, and 19-24, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Bhagwat et al. (US 6563517) in view of Ferguson (US 20020178232).

Bhagwat discloses dynamically adjusting transcoding parameters so as to increase the benefits of transcoding. Methods of adaptation are designed to cope with the variability of network characteristics and of the size of transcoded images. The invention also provides a method and apparatus to enable the transcoding proxy to adjust a quality-size tradeoff on a per-image and/or a per-client basis. The adaptive transcoder chooses different parameters for each object, and provides performance improvements. The invention further provides a general framework for making policy decisions taking into account available bandwidth, content and type of image, and user preferences. The invention also includes methods for generating feedback about the choice of optimal transcoding parameters to the user. (Bhagwat, Abstract)

Ferguson discloses an advertiser-supported interactive Web accelerator. It is a method for maximizing the use of available bandwidth while browsing the World Wide Web section of the Internet, by allowing users to dynamically pre-select content to be viewed next. The method reduces or eliminates the waiting associated with using the World Wide Web. The method utilizes an interface which displays itself in

accompaniment with known Web browser software, onto which the user can dynamically select hyperlinks from a Web page displayed in the window of a browser by "dragging-&-dropping" them with a pointing device, such as a mouse. This procedure allows for the real-time background downloading of Web pages which the user designates as the next Web pages he/she wants to view, while he/she is viewing other content.; These dragged-&-dropped links are downloaded in the background according to a sophisticated schedule of bandwidth priority when the connection between the client and the server is idle, and stored in a cache on the user's hard drive as Q-Links. The Q-Links stored in the hard drive cache are presented in a list in the interface of the invention. When the user is ready to view the previously selected pages, the user can click on any of the Q-Links in the list, which displays that content directly from hard drive cache to the browser. Since the requested pages now come from the hard drive instead of from across the Internet, the method significantly reduces or eliminates the user's the wait time for downloading. The interface of the invention also has an area to display advertisements. The user can click on the advertisement and is transferred to that advertiser's Web page. These advertisements are rotated with periodic downloads from a head-end computer across the Internet. Additionally, the invention has a monitoring system to determine the user's utilization of the invention. Data concerning users' interactions with advertisements and Q-Links is reported from the invention with periodic uploads to a database stored in a head-end computer across the Internet. This data assists in the targeting of customized advertising and the selling of the advertising space. (Ferguson, Abstract)

The Examiner's attention is directed to the fact that Bhagwat and Ferguson fail to teach, disclose, or suggest "delaying the requested object when the requested object has a priority that is below a threshold priority and forwarding the requested object to the second component when the requested object has a priority that is greater than or equal to said threshold priority", as recited in independent claim 1. Independent claim 19 cites similar structure.

The present invention, in one embodiment, discloses that proxy server 30 performs some traditional proxy functions like caching and filtering of objects.

Additionally, the proxy server 30 is configured to artificially delay an object that is received from the server 20 and that is to be forwarded to the client 40. This is done by using a combination of temporary suspension of data transfer on some connections 50 and HTTP redirection messages that force a browser running on the client 40 to repeat an object requested after a certain period of time. By using these mechanisms the proxy server 30 re-orders the HTTP responses received from the server 20 in such a way that objects having a higher priority are delivered to the client 40 first. For that purpose the proxy server 30 dynamically assigns priorities to the objects to be forwarded to the client 40. In order to ensure that delaying of the less important objects does not cause the link 14 between the proxy server 30 and the client 40 to become idle, the proxy server 30 continuously or at least repeatedly monitors the traffic on this link 14. (See Applicant's published Specification, ¶ [0040])

In contrast, Bhagwat fails to teach delaying the requested object when the requested object has a low priority. Bhagwat actually teaches that its store-and-forward proxy takes an original image and introduces a delay by transcoding the original image then forwarding the transcoded image to the client. Since Bhagwat teaches that a transcoded image (i.e., not the original image) is sent to its client, Bhagwat cannot teach that which is recited by the Applicant's claim, namely, "forwarding the requested object to the second component", as is recited by independent claims 1 and 19. Ferguson is cited only for its alleged teaching of prioritizing request and suspending connection to item. (See Office Action, Section 7) As such, Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of Bhagwat and Ferguson fails to teach what is recited by Applicant's independent claims.

The Examiner's attention is also directed to the fact that the combination of Bhagwat and Ferguson fails to teach "assigning a specific attribute to an object which is to be delayed", as recited in independent claims 14, 20, and 22. The Office Action is silent as to whether or not the Bhagwat and Ferguson references teach this limitation. As such, Applicant takes the position that this limitation is not taught by the cited references.


In view of the above arguments, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 14, 19, 20, and 22 are patentable over the combination of Bhagwat and Ferguson. Claims 2-13, 15, 16, 21, 23, and 24 are patentable at least by virtue of depending from their respective base claim. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing remarks, the Applicant believes all of the claims currently pending in the Application to be in a condition for allowance. The Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw all rejections and issue a Notice of Allowance for all pending claims.

The Applicant requests a telephonic interview if the Examiner has any questions or requires any additional information that would further or expedite the prosecution of the Application.

Respectfully submitted,



Thomas Bethea, Jr.
Reg. No. 53,987

Date: August 11, 2009

Ericsson Inc.
6300 Legacy Drive
M/S EVR 1-C-11
Plano, TX 75024
972-583-4859
thomas.bethea.jr@ericsson.com